DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 828 SP 004 074

AUTHOR	Henderson, George
TITLE	Programs To Alter Negative Attitudes Toward Integration; An Exploratory Study and Review of Literature.
SPONS AGENCY	American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D.C.; Oklahoma Univ., Norman.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	24p.
AVAILABLE FROM	AFT Order Dept., 1012 14th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005 (RMS#5, $0.35)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.30
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role, *Changing Attitudes, *Inservice Teacher Education, School Integration, *School Personnel, Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This paper contains a review of related literature and an exploratory study of public school district programs aimed at altering negative staff attitudes toward racial integration. An introductory section notes the significance of "social attitudes" in relationship to the problem and discusses what is involved in changing attitudes. The three sections of the literature review focus on studies of 1) teachers--their attitude and role in school desegregation problems; 2) administrators--their attitudes and role, particularly in school-community relations relations; and 3) institutes--their role in providing new techniques and practices and attitude change for meeting the problems of integration. The exploratory study is reported which involved 1) field visits to seven public school districts (Atlanta, Austin, Boston, Detroit, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and San Francisco) and 2) questionnaires (41 percent returned) mailed to the 75 school districts listed in "Racial Isolation in the Public Schools." The findings reported include information on the types of inservice training programs conducted, kinds of activities they involved, rationale behind them, and results. The summary section draws concluding implications regarding the types of programs most likely to be effective in bringing about positive attitude change on the part of all school personnel involved in the problems of integrated schools. (A 32-item bibliography is included.) (JS)

ED041828

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

programs to alter negative attitudes toward integration

an exploratory study
and review of literature

Dr. George Henderson

Goldman Professor of Human Relations
The University of Oklahoma

SP004074

INTRODUCTION

This study brings to light the fact that the surveyed school districts place a low priority on positive staff attitudes toward school desegregation. It is regrettable that school administrations should ever adopt such a position. And this is doubly true at this time when the percentages of non-whites among the school populations in the cities are rising sharply.

Teachers by virtue of their intimate contact with students are the most important element in the educational process that schools have to offer. The extent of the teachers' experience, the quality of their training, as well as their attitudes toward their students, are all very important.

Dr. George Henderson distressingly tells us that "...few of the districts in the study had a regular school program for changing negative staff attitudes toward desegregation."

It is worthy of noting that three school districts (Denver, Minneapolis, and Peoria, Ill.) outside of the south have regular in-service programs for their staff. No doubt this number will swell as northern and western school districts further desegregate in accordance with court rulings.

The study does a good job of guiding readers who may be interested in establishing in-service programs in their school districts. "Intellectual" activities must be complemented with sessions on intergroup relations. All programs should be structured so that there will be a free flow of expression and thought without fear of reprisal.

Low student achievement may, to some extent, determine the adverse effect prejudiced teachers have on students. But there may very well be no measuring rod for the psychological damage students of a different race or of the lower class suffer at the hands of prejudiced teachers or administrators.

Leonard Lewis, Director
Civil Rights Department
American Federation of Teachers

Malcom Little attended an "integrated" elementary school in a small town in Michigan.[1] He was an intelligent and conscientious student and, although he was the only black child in his class, perceived himself to be well-liked and accepted by his classmates and teachers. Malcolm's interest and hard work in school was prompted by an intense desire to become a professional man, a lawyer. This aspiration was thwarted by a white teacher, who decided not to let this ambition get out of hand. He informed Malcolm that "niggers don't become lawyers," and advised him to make a more practical choice -- become a carpenter instead. From that moment on and with those insensitive words of encouragement, Malcolm began to "change inside"; he dropped out of school that year and became neither a lawyer nor a carpenter, but a criminal -- "Detroit Red," a member of Harlem's underworld of narcotics, prostitution, and gambling. Finally, he was apprehended by the police and imprisoned for theft. Later, he became known as Malcolm X.

It's not entirely idle for educators to speculate about the possible course of Malcolm Little's life if he had received encouragement and help from the white teacher instead of the Honorable Elijah Muhammed and the Black Muslims. The hatred and bitterness for white people that marked much of the career of Malcolm X might never have developed, and his seemingly limitless energy, dedication, and integrity might have been harnessed for the betterment of all Americans, black and white. There are not many who have the potential for leadership that was evident in Malcolm X, but there are many black children who will, like Malcolm Little, give up their aspirations for knowledge or success in the classroom because of a poor self image initiated and nurtured by the low expectations of insensitive teachers in a desegregated school.[2]

---

*This study was financed by a grant from the Research Department, American Federation of Teachers. Additional funds for hiring Mrs. Ann Wise, research assistant, were secured from the Faculty Research Fund, University of Oklahoma.

As is exemplified in the life of Malcolm X, the progress of the black man in America is dependent to a great extent upon an improvement in the quality of increased education and dedication of teachers.[3] An obvious and important corollary of this statement is that the United States must not only believe in itself as a democratic society but also provide equal educational opportunities for all people. In an effort to foster this progress, the U. S. Supreme Court outlawed racially segregated public school systems.

Numerous studies related to school desegregation make it clear that the effectiveness of a school is largely a function of the characteristics of the people running it. Therefore, the weaknesses inherent in our school districts are not likely to be corrected by the eloquent rhetoric of educational policies, guidelines, and hastily planned curriculum changes but instead by the corrective behaviors of teachers and administrators.[4] Since it is the teacher who is primarily responsible for transmitting cultural values to the student, then it is the teacher who plays the most vital role in fostering the ideals required for an integrated society.[5] One important step for achieving both quality and equality of educational opportunity is the desegregation of faculty members. This is not merely a matter of legal compliance, but a visible sign of commitment to the ultimate goal of racial integration.[6]

Fifteen years after the historic 1954 Brown v. The Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, et al. decision, most of our public schools remain racially segregated. In fact, dilapidated buildings, inadequate facilities, and racially segregated classes are part of a pattern found in depressed area schools throughout America. As more educators focus on these problems, it becomes clear that while building new schools, improving facilities, and desegregating schools may help somewhat, a foremost problem facing school districts is to find ways to alter negative staff attitudes toward racial integration. An alarmingly large number of teachers and administrators do not believe in racial integration.

From personal observations, it seemed evident that faculty integration is more than placing black and white personnel within the same building. They must interact in an integrated manner. Nor is the length of time in the teaching profession an adequate indication of the attitudes an individual will have toward racial integration. We used the preceding thoughts as a basis for conducting: (1) a review of related literature and (2) an exploratory study of public school district programs aimed at altering negative staff attitudes toward racial integration.

Significance of Social Attitudes

It has long been known that a general relationship exists between the conditions of socioeconomic status and attitudinal development. Attitudes are, in a sense, the determinates on one's psycho-social effectiveness or ineffectiveness. They pertain to the way a person feels, thinks, and behaves in a definite situation. They are the results of feeling tones associated with every human experience. An individual responds with approval or disapproval when stimulated by a person, situation, idea, or activity. This response of acceptance or rejection is established by the learner's previous experiences. If the learner is in a negative stimulating environment, his attitudes are likely to be negative. Positive or negative attitudes become engrained in the personality. When an individual accumulates too many undesirable feeling tones, he develops negative attitudes toward himself, others, school, and society in general.

For our purposes a social attitude is a mental and neural readiness to behave in a given manner toward an object or a situation. Broadly, it defines an individual's position for or against an object, situation, person, or group. Although not directly observable, attitudes can be inferred from overt behaviors. Despite Edward Thorndike's dictum that everything that exists can be measured, some behavioral scientists consider attitudes as being intangible, defying accurate

measurement.[7] Essentially, the problem of validity -- success with which attitude scales measure what they purport to measure -- is the major obstacle to wider acceptance of attitude studies.

Whatever difficulties of measurement, many negative attitudes toward racial minority groups are developed in elementary and secondary schools; and, specifically, school personnel and textbooks are often responsible for fostering prejudice in children. The following propositions summarize the literature pertaining to social attitudes:

1. Attitudes are learned.
2. Attitudes are learned mainly from other people.
3. Attitudes are learned mainly from other people who have high or low prestige for us.
4. Once attitudes have been learned, they are reinforced by a variety of motives.[8]

In other words, social attitudes represent the residue of an individual's past experience.

Changing Attitudes

Some of the factors that may negatively affect the attitude of a school administrator are: nonwhite students who frequently are as many as 3 years behind the achievement level of white students, high absenteeism and yearly turnover, teachers who are unprepared to teach culturally disadvantaged students, and parents who have hostile attitudes toward the school. When an administrator believes that the maintenance of discipline is his chief function, he is likely to behave in a manner that will foster negative staff attitudes toward the students, parents and school-community. In these instances, the administrator gives support to the myth that school integration cannot work. On the other hand, when he views his job as being primarily to serve as the community's education leader and he seeks to bridge the culture gap between students, parents, and school personnel, the administrator is likely to foster a school climate that is conducive to

integration.

The key figure in the entire educational process is the teacher. Teacher attitudes have the most significant impact on pupil achievements and school adjustment. In fact, a teacher's attitude can determine the success or failure of integration within his classroom. It is easier to detect negative attitudes than to change them. Daniel Katz outlined three techniques for changing attitudes: offer new information, threat of punishment, and promise of reward.[9] None of these techniques work well in modifying ego-defensive attitudes. When based on defense of ego, additional techniques are required, i.e., removal of the threat, catharsis or opportunity for ventilation of feelings, and acquisition of understanding by the individual regarding the reasons for his attitudes.

Dorwin Cartwright stressed the importance of group influence and pressure in changing attitudes.[10] In any practical attempt to change attitudes, group influence is of primary importance. The group serves two basic purposes in relation to attitude change: It can be a medium of change and it can be a target of change. Furthermore, the greater the sense of belonging an individual has, the greater will be the influence of the group on him; and the greater the prestige he has in the group, the greater will be the influence he can exert on others. Far too often, teachers and administrators with positive attitudes toward integration are coerced into either concealing their attitudes or changing them. New teachers in particular learn to reflect sanctioned attitudes, even to the detriment of the students.

Review of Literature

Teachers

Studies conducted during the 1950s pointed to great apprehension of black teachers for their job security under desegregation. Hurley Doddy cited numerous instances where moves toward desegregation resulted in loss of jobs for teachers.[11]

Robert Dwyer attributed this to the fact that there was greater opposition by whites to the integration of black teachers than to the integration of black children, resulting in the release of the majority of black teachers as integration proceeded.[12] A recent study estimates that between 1954 and 1965 one thousand black teachers permanently lost their jobs when their schools were desegregated.[13] Even those teachers who became members of previously all-white faculties experienced a great deal of anxiety and insecurity about their roles as members of a desegregated school faculty.[14] They could have benefited from an in-service program.

A study by Doddy and G. Franklin Edwards of 150 public school teachers and principals suggested another fear: that desegregation would demand greater academic preparation for the black teacher.[15] There is not sufficient data related to this proposition to either substantiate or negate it. Studies of the status and qualifications of black teachers do not compare them with white teachers of the same geographical area. It is safe, however, to suggest that separate teacher preparation is still not equal. The quality of specialized professional preparation that the black teacher obtains in a separate world of color-caste is seldom comparable with the preparation of non-black teachers. This is evidenced in the results of the National Teacher Examinations in which black teachers score significantly below the white teachers.[16]

There is a great need for further research to document the black teachers' current status and qualifications relative to that of white teachers and to determine the effect of desegregation on the positions of black teachers. Affected by increasing urbanization and population mobility, the few available statistics are seriously outdated. This also reflects the tendency of educators to continually engage in prescriptive activities and to ignore descriptive research.

The position of the black teacher in the community is well documented. Richard Lamana views black teachers as being part of the strategic elites in the black community.[16] They act as opinion leaders in their community and usually are an

important factor in effecting desegregation. Lamana attempted to relate the attitudes of black teachers toward school desegregation to the characteristics of the local community. Four Guttman scales, an index of community social scale, and several single-item indicators were used to define the variables. The results suggest that favorable attitudes toward desegregation varied directly with the size of the social scale of the community. The more liberal the community, the lesser the negative consequences anticipated by the teacher and the greater the desire and willingness to work to promote immediate implementation of the desegregation program.

Thomas Kettig conducted an extensive survey for doctoral research in 1957 concerning attitudes of teachers toward integration. The first part in the self-administered schedule tested knowledge of blacks in U. S. history; the second part was a Likert-type attitude scale measuring respondents' reactions to problem situations likely to arise under desegregation. The following are selected conclusions from that study:

1. Faculties of schools in cities where integration had been widely practiced were more willing to accept integration than the faculties of schools in cities where integration had not been so widely practiced.

2. Female teachers, as a group, were less willing to practice integration than male teachers.

3. There were no significant differences between teachers who taught different subjects.

4. Teachers who were the best informed about the facts of black histroy had the most liberal attitudes toward integration.

5. Younger teachers were not willing to accept integration quicker than older teachers.

6. Teachers who had past experience with racial groups other than their own were more willing to accept integration.

7. Black teachers indicated greater acceptance of integration than white teachers.[17]

A 1963 study by Nebraska Mays is an interesting adjunct to conclusion #7 above. Summarizing the responses of black and white teachers of recently desegregated public school faculties in southern districts, he concluded that black teachers were more reluctant to mix than white teachers; they more often requested freedom from interracial activities.[18] The growing trend toward black nationalism may cause even more black teachers to resist integration.

Jonathan Kozol focused on the attitudes of white teachers in ghetto area schools. He pointed to faculty bigotry, condescension of teachers toward young black children, and gross contempt manifested by teachers toward parents of non-white children.[19] David Gottlieb discussed the differing attitudes of black and white teachers in a midwestern low-income urban community.[20] There was a higher degree of job satisfaction among black than among white teachers. Black teachers listed large classes, poor equipment and supplies, and the lack of a proper curriculum as the major reasons for job dissatisfaction. White teachers cited the low level of ability of the students, their poor motivation, their lack of discipline, and the uncooperativeness of parents. Perceptions of the children differed markedly. The black teachers tended to see the children as happy, energetic, and fun-loving, while the white teachers perceived the same children as rebellious, talkative, and lazy.

The problem of providing quality education for black children compounds itself in urban ghetto schools where there is a substantial racial matching of teacher and student. As the city-wide student enrollment becomes increasingly more black, so too does the teaching staff. Most black students, it seems, will eventually attend schools with predominantly black teachers and this obviously will not improve the degree of integration. Some critics further state that this will perpetuate the segregation inferior educational system now existing in urban ghettoes. Despite the trend toward nationalism, many black teachers are still

eager to abandon all-black schools. These teachers run to predominantly white schools. Desegregated schools with majority nonwhite students have low prestige in the eyes of most teachers -- white and nonwhite.

The high turnover of teachers drains the desegregated schools with majority black students of much needed teacher talent, experience, and vitality. Among those who remain are many teachers whose conception of their job works against the education of their pupils. A study of teachers in ten public schools located in depressed areas of a large northern city revealed that the overwhelming majority of these teachers and their supervisors rejected the children and looked on them as inherently inferior.[21] The teachers believed their students to be incapable of profiting from a normal curriculum. Even worse, most children were believed to be intellectually inferior and therefore not capable of learning.

Constance Nelson emphasized that the teacher is the key person in the transitional period of desegregation because of his close contact not only with students but also with other teachers, parents, and members of the community. Her study of the Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools focused on the change in teachers' attitudes toward intergroup relations during their first year of teaching in a desegregated classroom.[22] Using the desegregated classroom as a "ready-made social laboratory" to study the effects of interracial interaction on attitudes, she noted that there was a significant difference in the attitudes of teachers in desegregated and segregated classrooms. The positive change scores were significantly higher for desegregated teachers, indicating a break-up in previously negative attitudes. Nelson suggested that in-service training during the transitional period might bring about an even more "favorable" attitude change. The unresearched postulates at the conclusion of the study suggest that such interpersonal variables as equal-status contacts (made possible by integrating faculties), strong local administrative support, and favorable group norms at the local level are aslo important concomitants of attitude change.

Administrators

Studies of the administrative role in the process of desegregation tend to focus primarily with school-community relations. The administrator is generally viewed as a liason to the community. He is responsible for lessening tension and friction and coping with the political machinations involved in the implementation of a desegregation plan. Little attention has been given to the administrator's responsibilities for the internal operation of the school(s) undergoing desegregation. It is difficult to ascertain whether this emphasis is reflective of the authors concerns for overcoming the obstacles to desegregation, or whether the role thus described has been internalized by the majority of administrators themselves. In the implementation of a desegregation program, a definite distinction exists between meeting the legal requirements of desegretation and achieving quality integration within the schools. The latter necessitates extensive planning with and training of staff, and designing operational procedures within the schools to foster intercommunication and to otherwise facilitate integration.

In a study of seven school systems in central Missouri, Robert Dwyer found that the administrator can be a positive force in the movement toward integration if he asserts such policy and takes decisive action in the early stages. On the other hand, if he is overly cautious and fearful, the administrator may be instrumental in creating conditions within the community that lead to additional tension and conflict.[23] Implementation of policy within the school designed to foster improved interracial relations is greatly facilitated if community feelings are positive or ill-defined. When feelings are marginal, administrators can be the deciding voice.

Dan Dodson cites the traditional role of the superintendent as one of the major factors causing the slow progress to date of school desegregation.[24] Traditionally, the superintendent's role is to mediate between the dominant power

in the community and minority groups. However, his position is tenuous, he is subject to recall by his school board. Controversy within the community usually results in a change of superintendents. The situation is exacerbated by the relative political unsophistication of racial minority groups. Another factor which impedes progress is the relative success of administrators to resist changes in the status quo. Despite many studies, commissions, and protests, little innovation occurs in our schools. Tokenism and gradualism have taken the guise of educational experimentation, demonstration, and special projects. In-service programs tend to reflect this condition.

Robert Crain and David Street minimize the ability of the superintendent to significantly affect the day-to-day operation of the school system.[25] Superintendents, they conclude, are responsible for the making of policy in the area of race relations, but implementation rests largely with the classroom teacher. The superintendent can exert little control over the classroom teachers and it is this group that largely determines the effectiveness and the real outputs of the system. (As a teacher said in a workshop that I attended, "The superintendent can propose changes, but I dispose of them by filing them in the wastebasket.")

In a study of southern administrators conducted in 1957, M. S. Shirley and H. T. Cropp documented a relationship between attitudes toward the desegregation decision and geographical position.[26] It was found that attitudes toward desegregation were increasingly hostile as one proceeded further South. This hostility was further correlated to the proposition that the lower the educational standards, the greater the resistance to desegregation. Recent protests in non-southern, high standard school districts do not corroborate this finding. It appears the resistance is high in most communities.

Institutes

A dissertation by Ronald Dearden provided the material for a summary of thirty-seven desegregation institutes held during the summer of 1965 under Title IV,

Section 404 of the 1965 Civil Rights Act.[27] He utilized a survey instrument sent to 1,770 randomly selected participants and his conclusions are based on an analysis of their perceptions of the institutes which they attended. The study indicated that the institute courses and activities were: (1) very successful in increasing the participants' knowledge of the problems related to school desegregation, (2) very successful in acquainting the participants with the recent advances and developments in school desegregation, (3) moderately successful in familiarizing the participants with newer instructional and noninstructional methods for dealing with the problems of school desegregation, and (4) moderately successful in altering the attitudes of the participants toward school desegregation. The study concluded that the summer desegregation institutes were beneficial in improving the ability of public school personnel to deal with special education problems occasioned by school desegregation and that the programs should be continued and expanded.

Dearden's positive assessment was reiterated by Bernard Kinnick[28] and Barbara Arnstine[29] in their evaluation of institutes held in Georgia and at Tennessee, respectively, in the winter of 1965. Arnstine emphasized the importance of providing new techniques and practices only when they have relevance to the particular problems of the teachers. She suggested that it is imperative to establish the hypothesis that behavior is learned. Only then can the symptoms be separated from the causes of the educational problems that the teachers experience. She concluded that is was necessary to devise a method whereby the responses and questions of the teachers can continually be evaluated to insure that the institute is successful in dealing with meaningful problems.

Kinnick dealt less with operational procedures and more with an analysis of attitude change among participants. Comparing attitude and value assessments of the Institute at its conclusion and three months following the termination of the

Institute, he found that the participants had become more tolerant of blacks and of school desegregation policies and, as a group, expressed less authoritarian and ethnocentric tendencies. The instruments used were the California E and F scales, the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, and a desegregation scale constructed by the investigator.

An earlier article by Sam Wiggins is representative of the many subjective evaluations of biracial study groups and conferences found in the literature.[30] Without presenting hard data, Wiggins reported that significant attitude changes result from in-service programs and that participants evidence a breaking down of pre-conceived stereotypes and a greater acceptance of the other racial group.

The Study

This exploratory study consisted of three parts: (1) a review of the literature, (2) field visits to seven public school districts, and (3) questionnaires mailed to the seventy-five school districts listed in Racial Isolation in the Public Schools.[31]

The following school districts were visited between February and May of 1969: Atlanta (Georgia), Austin (Texas), Boston (Massachusetts), Detroit (Michigan), Los Angeles (California), Philadelphia (Pennsylvania), and San Francisco (California). With the exception of Austin, school officials responsible for in-service training were interviewed in each of the districts. In Austin, interviews were conducted with officials of the State of Texas Education Agency. In all instances, the interview was enthusiastically received.

None of the districts visited had a regular school program for changing negative staff attitudes toward desegregation. All, however, provided short (one to eight weeks) workshops -- usually conducted in the summer -- to acquaint teachers with "culturally disadvantaged" children. Most of these workshops were funded under Titles I and II of the Civil Rights Act of 1965. The absence of permanent programs was positively correlated with the absence of viable plans for

immediate school desegregation. The major program emphasis of the districts visited was compensatory education, not integrated education. None were concerned primarily with changing attitudes toward integration. One candid school official said, "We've abandoned quality integration in favor of quality segregated education. The white exodus out of the city almost precludes any meaningful integration."

All of the districts visited offered programs that focused on Black or Afro-American History, Spanish-speaking children, and other aspects of understanding minority group students. The effectiveness of the compensatory programs are at best questionable. Pre-and post-test data were not available. Program evaluations, therefore, were subjective, bordering on popularity contests (i.e., ranking speakers in order of preference.) It is likely that the administrators and teachers who held the most negative attitudes were seldom program participants. One school official, summing up the prevalent views of the others interviewed, said, "We get mostly the same concerned, dedicated people in all of our programs. Even when the others show up it is doubtful that we change their attitudes."

Most in-service programs stressed the following activities (ranked in order of importance):

1. Small group discussions.
2. Guest lecturers from outside the school system.
3. School personnel serving as lecturers.
4. Panel discussions.
5. Reading materials.
6. Films.

Most districts paid participants $15.00 per day and gave credit toward salary increments for the participation.

Thirty-two (41%) of the questionnaires were returned. Of this number, seven (22%) had a regular school program to prepare administrators and teachers for school desegregation. Denver (Colorado), Little Rock (Arkansas), Minneapolis (Minnesota), Oklahoma City (Oklahoma), Peoria (Illinois), Raleigh (North Carolina), and Tulsa

(Oklahoma) were the districts reporting regular in-service training programs. Only the Tulsa Public Schools' program place the major emphasis on changing negative attitudes of participants toward school desegregation. Four districts stressed techniques for improving school procedures; and two districts sought mainly to "acquaint" participants with the social problems related to school desegregation.

Most of the school officials -- in personal interviews or questionnaires -- concluded that properly planned in-service training programs could change negative attitudes; every school district should have a permanent in-service program; in-service programs without a system-wide plan for integration are doomed to failure. While there were no outstanding total programs, some of the districts visited had the following outstanding isolated practices:

1. Two boards of education and superintendents of schools have taken a forthright position regarding the types of school-community activities that will or will not be tolerated. Specifically, they have publicly asserted their determination to achieve integration.

2. Workshops are given which utilize school and community resource "experts" and center on improving staff attitudes. In three districts, it was reported that often negative attitudes are held by teachers who have a sincere desire to help disadvantaged students. For these teachers it is merely a matter of providing corrective guidelines. Other teachers are consciously negative and require more assistance in changing.

3. In two school districts, compensatory workshops are directed by individuals skilled in using group dynamics techniques. During their training sessions, attitudes and not individuals are analyzed. In one district, group training is supplemented with individual psychotherapy for personnel who have deep-rooted prejudices.

4. Two school districts pay tuition for administrators and teachers who take postgraduate college courses designed to add to their understanding of and ability to work in integrated schools.

5. "Good" teaching, as defined by local administrator-teacher committees, is being rewarded in three districts. Far too often good teaching goes unrewarded and bad teaching is rewarded, i.e., by promotions. Reduced teaching loads, better facilities and supplies, and salary differentials are "rewards" that these districts are using to encourage good teaching in desegregated schools.

The above activities are based upon the assumptions that individuals with negative attitudes (as evidenced in behavior) should first recognize a need for change; second, that they should be given an opportunity to change, and; finally that they should be rewarded for maintaining positive attitudes. Changes in the attitudes of school personnel toward racial integration usually occur as teachers and administrators become aware of the need for and in the process of change.

Finally, the officials interviewed stated that it is imperative the directors of such programs have certain qualities (credential) acceptable to the participants in the program, i.e., be trustworthy and an "expert" in the subject of change. In some instances, students and low-income parents have been used as paid consultants. Not only must the communicator's message come through clear, but it also must come through with a high degree of authority. The communicator's message is better received if it is believable to the intended receiver.

None of the school districts have come to grips with yet another problem: What is to be done with school personnel who participate in in-service programs and still behave prejudicially?

Summary

Intra-faculty and school personnel relations in a desegregated school should be designed for both teachers and administrators. In structuring an in-serivce training program to prepare school personnel for desegregation, it is suggested

that participants be composed of teachers and administrators from the same school or from the same geographical area. This insures that the group will have an opportunity for continued contact and will provide for a continuation of discussion and solution of common problems. This close contact will maximize communication between teachers and administrative personnel, and there is likely to be greater potential for concerted efforts. Increased contact may also help to eliminate the self-imposed social segregation of black and white school personnel.

Another area of apprehension for in-service participants is the expected wider range of abilities in a desegregated classroom than when students are drawn from a so-called "homogeneous" neighborhood. Training programs must be oriented toward minimizing such fears and increasing individualized instruction in order to maximize the education of all students. Instructional and non-instructional techniques must be presented during the training so that the trainees will feel a minimum of anxiety when working in desegregated schools.

The trainees perceptions of children from diverse backgrounds are often untrue, emotional responses. It is important, therefore, that training sessions involve the participants in other than "intellectual" activities such as outside readings. To effect significant attitude or behavioral change, an increase in the individual's information or cognitive knowledge must be accompanied by an increase in his social awareness and sensitivity. Therefore, outside readings and lectures must be complemented with training in intergroup relations and involvement with children and adults in the school-community.

Discussion groups should be structured so that the participants are enabled and encouraged to continually evaluate their own attitudes and responses to desegregation. Often the placing of teachers in the same discussion groups with administrators impedes teacher participation. Objective evaluation throughout the program by the training staff is necessary to insure that the program format

is achieving the goals of the program, and also meeting the needs and dealing with the concerns of the participants. "Outside" evaluators may be even better.

As a rule, attitudinal change is more likely to occur where there is free expression without fear of reprisal and where the group members are allowed full participation in important group decisions, including program planning and evaluation. The lecture method by itself has practically no influence on attitudes.

Postscript

A racially integrated school system is in itself no panacea for the ills of our society. However, if our schools were staffed with teachers committed to racial integration, equality of educational opportunity would become a reality and not remain a dream. Teaching in any school, no matter how homogeneous or prepared its students, is not an easy task. But for teachers who are committed in some way to education for an integrated society, the challenge is even greater. James Baldwin sums up the issue in his message to teachers:

> In an attempt to correct so many generations of bad faith and cruelty when it's operating not only in the classroom but in society, you will meet the most fantastic, the most brutal and the most determined resistance. . . .but you must find a way to use this tremendous potential and this tremendous energy a child represents. If this country does not find a way to use that energy, it will be destroyed by that energy.[32]

The Malcolm Littles in the classrooms reflect the attitudes of their teachers and administrators. Negative attitudes continue to go unchanged.

References

1. Robert Coles, "What Can We Learn From the Life of Malcolm X", Teachers College Record (1966), 67:564-567.

2. Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobsen, Pygmalion in the Classroom, New York; Holf, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

3. Walter Daniel, "The Relative Progress of the Negro After a Century of Emancipation", Journal of Negro Education (1963), 32:311-320.

4. Henry S. Dyer, "School Factors and Equal Educational Opportunity", Harvard Educational Review (1968), 38:38-56.

5. Benetta Washington, "Growth and Cultural Conflict", in Education and Social Crisis, edited by Fulton R. Keach and W. Garner, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967, pp.384-388.

6. Sam P. Wiggins, "Faculty Desegregation -- Cues for Transition", Journal of Teachers Education (1966), 17:65-70.

7. Edward L. Thorndike, "Nature, Purposes, and General Methods of Measurement of Educational Products", Yearbook of National Social Studies Education (1918).

8. E. Llewellyn Queener, Introduction to Social Psychology, New York, William Sloane, 1951, p. 337.

9. Daniel Katz, "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes", Public Opinion Quarterly, (1960), 24:165-204.

10. Dorwin Cartwright, "Achieving Change in People: Some Applications of Group Dynamics Theory," Human Relations (1951), 4:381-392.

11. Hurley H. Doddy, "Desegregation and the Employment of Negro Teachers", Journal of Negro Education (1955), 24:405-408.

12. Robert J. Dwyer, "The Negro Teacher and Desegregation", Sociology and Social Research (1957), 42:26-30.

13. The Negro Handbook, Chicago: Johnson, 1966, pp. 120-121.

14. Nebraska Mays, "Behavioral Expectations of Negro and White Teachers on Recently Desegregated Public School Faculties", Journal of Negro Education (1963), 32:218-226.

15. Hurley H. Doddy and G. Edwards Franklin, "Apprehension of Negro Teachers Concerning Desegregation in South Carolina", Journal of Negro Education (1955), 24:26-43.

16. Richard A. Lamana, "The Negro Teacher and Desegregation: A Study of Strategic Decision-Makers and Their Vested Interests in Different Community Contexts", Sociological Inquiry (1965), 35:26-40.

17. Thomas Hoskins Kettig, Attitudes of Ohio Public School Teachers Toward Racial Integration, Ph. D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1957.

18. Mays,

19. Johnathan Kozol, "Halls of Darkness: In the Ghetto Schools", Harvard Educational Review (1967), 37:379-407.

20. David Gottlieb, "Teaching and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers", Sociology of Education (1964), 37:345-353.

21. Martin Trow, "Two Problems in American Public Education", in The Sociology of Education, edited by Robert Bell and H. Stub, Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1968, pp. 8-43.

22. Constance B. Nelson, An Exploratory Study of Change in Teachers' Attitudes Toward Intergroup Relations in the Classroom During the First Year of Desegregation in the Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Missouri at Kansas City, 1958.

23. Robert Dwyer J., "The Administrative Role in Desegregation", Sociology and Social Research (1959), 43:183-188.

24. Dan W. Dodson, "School Administration, Control, and Public Policy Concerning Integration", Journal of Negro Education (1965), 34:255.

25. Robert L. Crain and David Street, "School Desegregation and School Decision-Making", Urban Affairs Quarterly (1966), 2:64-82.

26. M. S. Shirley and H. T. Cropp, "Superintendents' Attitudes Toward Desegregation in the Public Schools", Sociology and Social Research (1957), 41:181-186.

27. Dearden, Ronald Arthur, A Descriptive Analysis of the Perceptions of Selected School Personnel Enrolled in the 1965 Summer Desegregation Institutes, Ed. D. Dissertation, George Washington University, 1967.

28. Arnstine, Barbara C., "Making the In-Service Institute Operational", Adult Leadership (1966), 15:77.

29. Kinnick, Bernard Conrad, An Experimental Study and Analysis of Attitudinal Change Toward Negroes and School Desegregation among Participants in a Summer Institute Sponsored Under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Ed. D. Dissertation, Auburn University, 1966.

30. Wiggins, Sam P., "The Southern High School Principal", National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin (1956), 40:72-79.

31. U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

32. James Baldwin, "A Talk to Teachers", in Education and Social Crisis, edited by E. Keach, R. Fulton, and W. Garner, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967, pp. 263-268.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. George Henderson is the Goldman Professor of Human Relations at the University of Oklahoma in Norman, Oklahoma. Previously he had served as Associate Professor of Sociology and Education at that institution.

Dr. Henderson studied at both Michigan State and Wayne State, earning his Ph.D. in 1965 from the latter. From 1957 to 1967 he served in a number of positions in Detroit: social caseworker; social economist for the Housing Commission; Community Services Director for the Urban League; Program Director of the Mayor's Committee, Community Action for Detroit Youth; Assistant Director of the Delinquency Control Training Center, Wayne State; Assistant Director of Intercultural Relations and Assistant to the Superintendent in the Detroit schools.

Dr. Henderson has lectured widely both in and out of Michigan and Oklahoma and also has published widely in such journals as Social Casework, Journal of Human Relations, Teachers College Record, Journal of Secondary Education, Negro Digest, Journal of Negro Education, Social Studies, and the Peabody Journal of Education.

He is the recipient of numerous awards including the Charles Kelly Labor Research Scholarship from Wayne State University in 1957 and, of course, an AFT Research Grant in 1969.

Published in March, 1970

under the research grant program

of the

American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO

Washington, D.C.

Available at 35¢ a copy from

AFT Order Department

1012 14th St. N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005

Please mention item RMS # 5